

U.S. Appl. No. 09/819,264
Reply to Final Office Action dated May 17, 2006

PATENT
450100-03087

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 10 2006

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 9-11, which are independent, are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the Specification as originally filed and specifically on page 20. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,529,878 to DeRafael, et al. (hereinafter, merely "DeRafael").

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over DeRafael in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,400,248 to Chisholm (hereinafter, merely "Chisholm").

U.S. Appl. No. 09/819,264
Reply to Final Office Action dated May 17, 2006

PATENT
450100-03087

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1, recites, *inter alia*:

"A contents market research system...

wherein advertisements are sent directly to the pollee using the personal information included in the contents polling information;

wherein said contents introduction information is classified into separate subdivisions as a function of subject matter; and

wherein said contents introduction information is sent to a contents polling apparatus of said pollee who is suitable for said subject matter." (Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicant, DeRafael relates to a system and method for compensating users for responding to advertisements in an interactive manner which poses questions for users and dynamically generates further questions in response to users' answers to previous questions.

Applicant respectfully submits that DeRafael fails to teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Indeed, Applicant submits that nothing has been found in DeRafael that would teach or suggest a contents market research system, wherein advertisements are sent directly to the pollee using the personal information included in the contents polling information, said contents introduction information is classified into separate subdivisions as a function of subject matter, and said contents introduction information is sent to a contents polling apparatus of said pollee who is suitable for said subject matter, as recited in claim 1.

Indeed, DeRafael discloses on column 4, lines 15-21 that "processor 10 hosts or publishes interactive electronic advertisements that are provided by each advertiser 14. A user can select one of these advertisements. In accordance with the selected advertisement, processor 10 asks questions of user 12, and user 10 provides answers in response." Further, Figure 1 of

U.S. Apln. No. 09/819,264
Reply to Final Office Action dated May 17, 2006

PATENT
450100-03087

DeRafael discloses that advertisements are sent from the advertiser 14 to the processor 10, which sends advertisements to user 12 in exchange for compensation.

However, in the present invention, advertisements are sent directly to the pollee using the personal information entered by the pollee.

Further, Chisholm fails to cure the deficiencies of DeRafael.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 9-11 are also believed to be patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

U.S. Appl. No. 09/819,264
Reply to Final Office Action dated May 17, 2006

PATENT
450100-03087

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800